arXiv:1611.01562v1 [math.RA] 4 Nov 2016

σ-PBW Extensions of Skew Armendariz Rings

Armando Reyes*
Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Héctor Suárez†
Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to investigate a general notion of σ-PBW extensions over Armendariz rings. As an application, the properties of being Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p. and p.q.-Baer are established for these extensions. We generalize several results in the literature for Ore extensions of injective type and skew PBW extensions.

Key words and phrases. Armendariz, Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p. and p.q.-Baer rings, skew Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt extensions.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16S36, 16S80, 16U20.

1 Introduction

A commutative ring B is called *Armendariz* (the term was introduced by Rege and Chhawchharia in [42]) if for polynomials $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n$, $g(x) = b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m$ of $B[x]$ which satisfy $f(x)g(x) = 0$, then $a_ib_j = 0$, for every i, j. As we can appreciate, the interest of this notion lies in its natural and its useful role in understanding the relation between the annihilators of the ring B and the annihilators of the polynomial ring $B[x]$. For instance, in [3], Lemma 1, Armendariz showed that a *reduced* ring (i.e., a ring without nonzero nilpotent elements) always satisfies this condition (reduced rings are *Abelian* that is, every idempotent is central, and also semiprime, i.e., its prime radical is trivial). For non-commutative rings, more exactly the well-known Ore extensions introduced by Ore in [41], the notion of Armendariz has been also studied. Commutative and non-commutative treatments have been investigated in several papers, see [3], [42], [1], [26], [20], [18], [29], [35], and others.

The non-commutative rings of interest for us in this article are the σ-PBW extensions (also known as skew Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt extensions) introduced in [11]. These structures are more general than iterated Ore extensions of injective type defined by Ore in [41], universal enveloping algebras of finite dimensional Lie algebras, PBW extensions introduced by Bell and Goodearl in [5], almost normalizing extensions defined by McConnell and Robson in [34], solvable polynomial rings introduced by Kandri-Rody and Weispfenning in [23], and generalized by Kredel in [27],

*Departamento de Matemáticas. e-mail: mareyesv@unal.edu.co
†Escuela de Matemáticas y Estadística. e-mail: hjsuarezs@unal.edu.co

diffusion algebras introduced by Isaev, Pyatov, and Rittenberg in [21], and other algebras. The importance of σ-PBW extensions is that we do not assume that the coefficients commute with the variables, and we take coefficients not necessarily in fields (see Definition 2.1). In fact, the σ-PBW extensions contain well-known groups of algebras such as some types of G-algebras in the sense of Levandovskyy [30], Auslander-Gorenstein rings, some Calabi-Yau and skew Calabi-Yau algebras, some Artin-Schelter regular algebras, some Koszul algebras, quantum polynomials, some quantum universal enveloping algebras, and others (see [43] or [33] for a detailed list of examples). With respect to Clifford and Grassman algebras, skew PBW extensions are also important. More precisely, since any Clifford algebra is a quotient of a solvable polynomial ring by a two-sided ideal ([23], p. 24), and solvable polynomial rings are strictly contained in σ-PBW extensions, then Cliford and Grassman algebras are quotients of σ-PBW extensions by two-sided ideals (in [43] and [32] it was presented a characterization of ideals in σ-PBW extensions). For more details about the relation between σ-PBW extensions and another algebras with PBW bases, see [43] or [33].

Now, since ring, module and homological properties of σ-skew PBW extensions have been studied by the authors and others (see [11], [31], [43], [44], [45], [32], [46], [50], [40], [47], [49], [48], and others), the aim of this paper is to establish a general notion of *skew* Armendariz ring for σ-PBW extensions which generalize the case of Ore extensions and previous papers, and formulate new results for several non-commutative algebras which can not be expressed as iterated Ore extensions. The theory developed here generalizes the treatments presented in [39] for Ore extensions of injective type, and the results established in [46], [40], and [49] for skew PBW extensions. As an application of our treatment, we characterize the properties of being Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p. and p.q.-Baer for these extensions generalizing several results in the literature for Ore extensions of injective type and skew PBW extensions ([17], [26], [16], [18], [37], [36], [38], [39], [19], [46], [40], and [49]).

Next, we describe the structure of this article. In Section 2 we establish some useful results about σ-PBW extensions for the rest of the paper. In Section 3 we present a review of the proposals about a notion of Armendariz ring for these extensions. Then, in Section 4 we introduce two notions of Armendariz: skew-Armendariz (Definition 4.1) and a more general notion, the weak skew-Armendariz (Definition 4.2). These definitions are motivated by the treatment developed in [39] for Ore extensions, and generalize the theory for classical polynomial rings, Ore extensions of injective type, and skew PBW extensions (c.f. [3], [42], [1], [26], [20], [18], [29], [35], and [38], [46], [40], [49], and others). In particular, we show that the families of Armendariz rings defined in [40] and [49] are strictly contained in the family of skew-Armendariz (or the family of weak skew-Armendariz) but the converse is false. In this section we also prove that if R is a weak skew-Armendariz ring, then R and A are Abelian (Propositions 4.9 and 4.10, respectively), and we characterize the property of skew-Armendariz over the classical right quotient rings of R (Theorem 4.12). In Section 5 we generalize the results presented by the authors in [46], [40], and [49], about the characterizations of being Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p. and the p.q.-Baer for σ-PBW extensions. We adapt the ideas presented in [39] and use the notion of (Σ, Δ)-ideal (this notion was used in [45] and [32] for the study of the uniform dimension and the prime ideals of σ-PBW extensions, respectively), and the notion of (Σ, Δ)-quasi-baer rings.

Throughout the paper, the word ring means a ring with unity not necessarily commutative.

2 Definitions and elementary properties

We start recalling the definition and some preliminaries about our object of study.

Definition 2.1 ([11], Definition 1)**.** Let R and A be rings. We say that A is a σ-PBW extension of R (also called *skew PBW extension of* R), if the following conditions hold:

(i) $R \subseteq A$;

(ii) there exist elements $x_1, \dots, x_n \in A$ such that A is a left free R-module with basis $\text{Mon}(A) := \{x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n} \mid \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$, and $x_1^0 \cdots x_n^0 := 1 \in \text{Mon}(A)$.

(iii) For each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and any $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$, there exists an element $c_{i,r} \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x_i r - c_{i,r} x_i \in R$.

(iv) For any elements $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, there exists $c_{i,j} \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x_j x_i - c_{i,j} x_i x_j \in R + Rx_1 + \cdots + Rx_n$ (i.e., there exist elements $r_0^{(i,j)}, r_1^{(i,j)}, \dots, r_n^{(i,j)} \in R$ with $x_j x_i - c_{i,j} x_i x_j = r_0^{(i,j)} + \sum_{k=1}^n r_k^{(i,j)} x_k$).

If all these conditions are satisfied, we will write $A := \sigma(R)\langle x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle$.

Proposition 2.2 ([11], Proposition 3)**.** *Let A be a skew PBW extension of R. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exist an injective endomorphism $\sigma_i : R \to R$ and a σ_i-derivation $\delta_i : R \to R$, such that $x_i r = \sigma_i(r) x_i + \delta_i(r)$, for each $r \in R$. We write $\Sigma := \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$, and $\Delta := \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$.*

Remark 2.3. With respect to the Definition 2.1 and the Proposition 2.2, we have the following remarks:

- Since $\text{Mon}(A)$ is a left R-basis of A, the elements $c_{i,r}$ and $c_{i,j}$ in Definition 2.1 are unique.
- In Definition 2.1 (iv), $c_{i,i} = 1$. This follows from the equality $x_i^2 - c_{i,i} x_i^2 = s_0 + s_1 x_1 + \cdots + s_n x_n$, with $s_i \in R$, which implies $1 - c_{i,i} = 0 = s_i$.
- If $i < j$ and $d_i', b_j' \in R$, then $d_i' x_i b_j' x_j = d_i'[\sigma_i(b_j') x_i + \delta_i(b_j')] x_j = d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') x_i x_j + d_i' \delta_i(b_j') x_j$. Since $x_j x_i = c_{i,j} x_i x_j + r^{(i,j)} + \sum_{k=1}^n r_k^{(i,j)} x_k$, then $d_j' x_j b_i' x_i = d_j'[\sigma_j(b_i') x_j + \delta_j(b_i')] x_i = d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') x_j x_i + d_j' \delta_j(b_i') x_i = d_j' \sigma_j(b_i')(c_{i,j} x_i x_j + r^{(i,j)} + \sum_{k=1}^n r_k^{(i,j)} x_k) + d_j' \delta_j(b_i') x_i$. In this way,

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_i' x_i b_j' x_j + d_j' x_j b_i' x_i &= d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') x_i x_j + d_i' \delta_i(b_j') x_j \\
&\quad + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') \left(c_{i,j} x_i x_j + r^{(i,j)} + \sum_{k=1}^n r_k^{(i,j)} x_k \right) + d_j' \delta_j(b_i') x_i \\
&= [d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') c_{i,j}] x_i x_j + d_j' \delta_j(b_i') x_i \\
&\quad + d_i' \delta_i(b_j') x_j + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') r^{(i,j)} + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') \sum_{k=1}^n r_k^{(i,j)} x_k \\
&= [d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') c_{i,j}] x_i x_j + [d_j' \delta_j(b_i') + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') r_i^{(i,j)}] x_i \\
&\quad + [d_i' \delta_i(b_j') + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') r_j^{(i,j)}] x_j + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') r^{(i,j)} + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') \sum_{k=1,\ k \neq i,j}^n r_k^{(i,j)} x_k.
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 2.4. ([11], Definition 4) Consider A a skew PBW extension of R.

(i) A is called *quasi-commutative* if the conditions (iii) and (iv) in Definition 2.1 are replaced by the following: (iii') for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and all $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $c_{i,r} \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x_i r = c_{i,r} x_i$; (iv') for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, there exists $c_{i,j} \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x_j x_i = c_{i,j} x_i x_j$.

(ii) A is called *bijective* if σ_i is bijective for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $c_{i,j}$ is invertible, for any $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

Examples 2.5. If $R[x_1; \sigma_1, \delta_1] \cdots [x_n; \sigma_n, \delta_n]$ is an iterated Ore extension where

- σ_i is injective, for $1 \leq i \leq n$;
- $\sigma_i(r)$, $\delta_i(r) \in R$, for every $r \in R$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$;
- $\sigma_j(x_i) = cx_i + d$, for $i < j$, and $c, d \in R$, where c has a left inverse;
- $\delta_j(x_i) \in R + Rx_1 + \cdots + Rx_n$, for $i < j$,

then $R[x_1; \sigma_1, \delta_1] \cdots [x_n; \sigma_n, \delta_n] \cong \sigma(R)\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$ ([33], p. 1212). In particular, note that skew PBW extensions of endomorphism type are more general than iterated Ore extensions $R[x_1; \sigma_1] \cdots [x_n; \sigma_n]$. On the other hand, skew PBW extensions are more general than Ore extensions of injective type (diffusion algebras, universal enveloping algebras of finite Lie algebras, and others, are examples of skew PBW extensions which can not be expressed as iterated Ore extensions, see [33] for more details). Skew PBW extensions contains various well-known groups of algebras such as PBW extensions [5], the almost normalizing extensions [34], solvable polynomial rings [23], and [27], diffusion algebras [21], some types of Auslander-Gorenstein rings, some skew Calabi-Yau algebras, some Artin-Schelter regular algebras, some Koszul algebras, quantum polynomials, some quantum universal enveloping algebras, etc. In comparison with G-algebras [30], σ-PBW extensions do not assume that the ring of coefficients is a field neither that the coefficients commute with the variables, so that skew PBW extensions are not included in these algebras. Indeed, the G-algebras with $d_{i,j}$ linear (recall that for these algebras $x_j x_i = c_{i,j} x_i x_j + d_{i,j},\ 1 \leq i < j \leq n$), are particular examples of σ-PBW extensions. A detailed list of examples of skew PBW extensions and its relations with another algebras with PBW bases is presented in [43], [33], and [50].

Definition 2.6 ([11], Definition 6)**.** Let A be a skew PBW extension of R with endomorphisms σ_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$, as in Proposition 2.2.

(i) For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $\sigma^\alpha := \sigma_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \sigma_n^{\alpha_n}$, $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n$. If $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$; then $\alpha + \beta := (\alpha_1 + \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_n + \beta_n)$.

(ii) For $X = x^\alpha \in \mathrm{Mon}(A)$, $\exp(X) := \alpha$, $\deg(X) := |\alpha|$, and $X_0 := 1$. The symbol $\succeq$ will denote a total order defined on $\mathrm{Mon}(A)$ (a total order on $\mathbb{N}^n$). For an element $x^\alpha \in \mathrm{Mon}(A)$, $\exp(x^\alpha) := \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$. If $x^\alpha \succeq x^\beta$ but $x^\alpha \neq x^\beta$, we write $x^\alpha \succ x^\beta$. Every element $f \in A$ can be expressed uniquely as $f = a_0 + a_1 X_1 + \cdots + a_m X_m$, with $a_i \in R$, and $X_m \succ \cdots \succ X_1$. With this notation, we define $\mathrm{lm}(f) := X_m$, the *leading monomial* of f; $\mathrm{lc}(f) := a_m$, the *leading coefficient* of f; $\mathrm{lt}(f) := a_m X_m$, the *leading term* of f; $\exp(f) := \exp(X_m)$, the *order* of f; and $E(f) := \{\exp(X_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq t\}$. Note that

$\deg(f) := \max\{\deg(X_i)\}_{i=1}^{t}$. Finally, if $f = 0$, then $\text{lm}(0) := 0$, $\text{lc}(0) := 0$, $\text{lt}(0) := 0$. We also consider $X \succ 0$ for any $X \in \text{Mon}(A)$. For a detailed description of monomial orders in skew PBW extensions, see [11], Section 3.

Proposition 2.7 ([11], Theorem 7)**.** *If A is a polynomial ring with coefficients in R and the set of variables $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, then A is a skew PBW extension of R if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *for each $x^\alpha \in \text{Mon}(A)$ and every $0 \neq r \in R$, there exist unique elements $r_\alpha := \sigma^\alpha(r) \in R \setminus \{0\}$, $p_{\alpha,r} \in A$, such that $x^\alpha r = r_\alpha x^\alpha + p_{\alpha,r}$, where $p_{\alpha,r} = 0$ or $\deg(p_{\alpha,r}) < |\alpha|$, if $p_{\alpha,r} \neq 0$. If r is left invertible, so is r_α.*

(ii) *For each $x^\alpha, x^\beta \in \text{Mon}(A)$ there exist unique elements $c_{\alpha,\beta} \in R$ and $p_{\alpha,\beta} \in A$ such that $x^\alpha x^\beta = c_{\alpha,\beta} x^{\alpha+\beta} + p_{\alpha,\beta}$, where $c_{\alpha,\beta}$ is left invertible, $p_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$ or $\deg(p_{\alpha,\beta}) < |\alpha + \beta|$, if $p_{\alpha,\beta} \neq 0$.*

Remark 2.8. ([46], Remark 2.10) If $X_i := x_1^{\alpha_{i1}} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_{in}}$ and $Y_j := x_1^{\beta_{j1}} \cdots x_n^{\beta_{jn}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} a_i X_i b_j Y_j = {} & a_i \sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j) x^{\alpha_i} x^{\beta_j} + a_i p_{\alpha_{i1}, \sigma_{i2}^{\alpha_{i2}}(\cdots(\sigma_{in}^{\alpha_{in}}(b)))} x_2^{\alpha_{i2}} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_{in}} x^{\beta_j} \\ & + a_i x_1^{\alpha_{i1}} p_{\alpha_{i2}, \sigma_3^{\alpha_{i3}}(\cdots(\sigma_{in}^{\alpha_{in}}(b)))} x_3^{\alpha_{i3}} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_{in}} x^{\beta_j} \\ & + a_i x_1^{\alpha_{i1}} x_2^{\alpha_{i2}} p_{\alpha_{i3}, \sigma_{i4}^{\alpha_{i4}}(\cdots(\sigma_{in}^{\alpha_{in}}(b)))} x_4^{\alpha_{i4}} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_{in}} x^{\beta_j} \\ & + \cdots + a_i x_1^{\alpha_{i1}} x_2^{\alpha_{i2}} \cdots x_{i(n-2)}^{\alpha_{i(n-2)}} p_{\alpha_{i(n-1)}, \sigma_{in}^{\alpha_{in}}(b)} x_n^{\alpha_{in}} x^{\beta_j} \\ & + a_i x_1^{\alpha_{i1}} \cdots x_{i(n-1)}^{\alpha_{i(n-1)}} p_{\alpha_{in}, b} x^{\beta_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this expression, we can see that when we compute every summand of $a_i X_i b_j Y_j$ we obtain products of the coefficient a_i with several evaluations of b_j in σ's and δ's depending of the coordinates of α_i.

3 A review of the Armendariz notions for σ-PBW extensions

For a ring B with a ring endomorphism $\sigma : B \to B$, and a σ-derivation $\delta : B \to B$, Krempa in [28] considered the Ore extension $B[x; \sigma, \delta]$, and defined σ as a *rigid endomorphism* if $b\sigma(b) = 0$ implies $b = 0$, for $b \in B$. Krempa called B *σ-rigid* if there exists a rigid endomorphism σ of B. Properties of being Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p., and p.q.-Baer over σ-rigid rings have been investigated (c.f. [28], [17], and others). All these results were generalized by the first author to the class of σ-PBW extensions. There, the key fact was an adequate notion of *rigidness* for these extensions. Let us recall it.

Definition 3.1. ([46], Definition 3.2) If B is a ring and Σ a family of endomorphisms of B, then Σ is called a *rigid endomorphisms family* if $r\sigma^\alpha(r) = 0$ implies $r = 0$, for every $r \in B$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$. A ring B is called to be *Σ-rigid* if there exists a rigid endomorphisms family Σ of B.

Note that if Σ is a rigid endomorphisms family, then every element $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$ is a monomorphism. In this way, we consider the family of injective endomorphisms Σ and the family Δ of Σ-derivations of a skew PBW extension A of a ring R (see Proposition 2.2). Σ-rigid rings are reduced rings: if B is a Σ-rigid ring and $r^2 = 0$, for $r \in B$, then $0 = r\sigma^\alpha(r^2)\sigma^\alpha(\sigma^\alpha(r)) =$

$r\sigma^{\alpha}(r)\sigma^{\alpha}(r)\sigma^{\alpha}(\sigma^{\alpha}(r)) = r\sigma^{\alpha}(r)\sigma^{\alpha}(r\sigma^{\alpha}(r))$, i.e., $r\sigma^{\alpha}(r) = 0$, and so $r = 0$, that is, B is reduced. By [46], Corollary 3.4, if A is a skew PBW extension of a Σ-rigid ring R, the equality $ab = 0$, for $a, b \in R$, implies $ax^{\alpha}bx^{\beta} = 0$ in A, for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Recall that if A is a σ-PBW extension of a ring R, then R is Σ-rigid if and only if A is a reduced ring ([46], Proposition 3.5).

With the purpose of generalizing the notion of σ-rigid ring and studying the properties of being Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p. and p.q.-Baer (the notion of Armendariz ring also was studied) over this more general structure, several notions of *skew* Armendariz rings have been established in the literature (c.f. [18], [37], [38]). Precisely, in [40] and [49], the authors generalized all these treatments for the case of skew PBW extensions by introducing the following definitions.

Definition 3.2. ([40], Definitions 3.4 and 3.5) Let A be a skew PBW extension of a ring R. We say that R is an (Σ, Δ)-*Armendariz ring*, if for polynomials $f = a_0 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_mX_m$ and $g = b_0 + b_1Y_1 + \cdots + b_tY_t$ in A, the equality $fg = 0$ implies $a_iX_ib_jY_j = 0$, for every i, j. We say that R is an (Σ, Δ)-*weak Armendariz ring*, if for linear polynomials $f = a_0 + a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n$ and $g = b_0 + b_1x_1 + \cdots + b_nx_n$ in A, the equality $fg = 0$ implies $a_ix_ib_jx_j = 0$, for every i, j.

Note that every Σ-rigid ring is a (Σ, Δ)-skew Armendariz ring ([40], Proposition 3.6).

Definition 3.3. ([49], Definitions 3.1 and 3.2) Let A be a skew PBW extension of a ring R. R is called a Σ-*skew Armendariz* ring, if for elements $f = \sum_{i=0}^{m} a_iX_i$ and $g = \sum_{j=0}^{t} b_jY_j$ in A, the equality $fg = 0$ implies $a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j) = 0$, for all $0 \leq i \leq m$ and $0 \leq j \leq t$, where $\alpha_i = \exp(X_i)$. R is called a *weak* Σ-*skew Armendariz* ring, if for elements $f = \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_ix_i$ and $g = \sum_{j=0}^{n} b_jx_j$ in A ($x_0 := 1$), the equality $fg = 0$ implies $a_i\sigma_i(b_j) = 0$, for all $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ ($\sigma_0 := \mathrm{id}_R$).

Note that every Σ-skew Armendariz ring is a weak Σ-skew Armendariz ring. If A is a skew PBW extension of a ring R, and if R is Σ-rigid, then R is Σ-skew Armendariz ([49], Proposition 3.4). The converse of this proposition is false as the following remark shows.

Remark 3.4.

- Consider the ring $B = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z},\ t \in \mathbb{Q} \right\}$. Then B is a commutative ring, and if we consider the automorphism σ of R given by $\sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & t/2 \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}$. In [18], Example 1, it was shown that R is σ-skew Armendariz and is not a σ-rigid. Since Σ-rigid and Σ-skew Armendariz are generalizations of σ-rigid and σ-skew Armendariz, respectively, this example shows that there exist an example of a Σ-skew Armendariz ring which is not Σ-rigid.

- Let $B = \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ be the commutative polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}_2$, and σ the endomorphism of $B = \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ defined by $\sigma(f(x)) = f(0)$. Then $B = \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ is σ-skew Armendariz and is not σ-rigid ([18], Example 5).

From definitions above we can establish the following relations

$$\Sigma-\text{rigid} \subsetneqq (\Sigma, \Delta)-\text{Armendariz} \subsetneqq (\Sigma, \Delta)-\text{weak Armendariz}$$

$$\Sigma-\text{rigid} \subsetneqq \Sigma-\text{skew Armendariz} \subsetneqq \text{weak } \Sigma-\text{skew Armendariz}$$

$$(\Sigma, \Delta)-\text{Armendariz} \subsetneqq \Sigma-\text{skew Armendariz}$$

$$(\Sigma,\Delta)-\text{weak Armendariz} \subsetneqq \text{weak } \Sigma-\text{skew Armendariz}$$

As we can appreciate, the more general class of rings consists of the weak Σ-skew Armendariz. The purpose of this paper is to introduce a generalization of these rings, the *weak skew-Armendariz* rings (Definition 4.2 below).

4 Skew-Armendariz and weak-Armendariz rings

In this section we introduce two new notions of Armendariz for σ-PBW extensions: skew-Armendariz (Definition 4.1) and a more general notion, the weak skew-Armendariz (Definition 4.2). These definitions generalize the treatments developed for both classical polynomial rings and Ore extensions of injective type (c.f. [3], [42], [1], [17], [26], [16], [20], [18], [29], [35], [37], [36], and [38], and [39], [46]). We show also that the families of Armendariz rings defined in [40] and [49] are contained in the family of skew-Armendariz and weak skew-Armendariz, but the converse is false.

Definition 4.1. Let R be a ring and A a skew PBW extension of R. We say that R is a *skew-Armendariz* ring, if for polynomials $f = a_0 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_mX_m$ and $g = b_0 + b_1Y_1 + \cdots + b_tY_t$ in A, $fg = 0$ implies $a_0b_k = 0$, for each $0 \leq k \leq t$.

Note that every Armendariz ring is skew-Armendariz, where $\sigma_i = \mathrm{id}_R$ and $\delta_i = 0$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$, and every Σ-skew Armendariz ring is also a skew-Armendariz ring. If R is Σ-rigid, the elements $c_{i,j}$ are invertible (Definition 2.1 (iv)), and they are at the center of R, from [46], Proposition 3.6 we know that R is skew-Armendariz.

Definition 4.2. Let R be a ring and A a skew PBW extension of R. We say that R is a *weak skew-Armendariz* ring, if for linear polynomials $f = a_0 + a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n$, and $g = b_0 + b_1x_1 + \cdots + b_nx_n$ in A, $fg = 0$ implies $a_0b_k = 0$, for every $0 \leq k \leq n$.

We can see that every skew-Armendariz ring is weak skew-Armendariz. However, a weak Armendariz ring is not necessarily Armendariz. As an illustration of this fact in the case of Ore extensions, see [29], Example 3.2. Of course, every weak Σ-skew Armendariz ring is a weak skew-Armendariz ring. So, we have the relations

$$\Sigma-\text{rigid} \subsetneqq (\Sigma,\Delta)-\text{Armendariz} \subsetneqq \Sigma-\text{skew Armendariz} \subsetneqq \text{skew} - \text{Armendariz}$$

and

$$\Sigma-\text{rigid} \subsetneqq (\Sigma,\Delta)-\text{weak Armendariz} \subsetneqq \text{weak } \Sigma-\text{skew Armendariz} \subsetneqq \text{weak skew} - \text{Armendariz}$$

In this way, the results presented in this paper for skew-Armendariz and weak skew-Armendariz rings generalize all results established in the previous papers [46], [40], and [49], for skew PBW extensions, and in particular, for Ore extensions of injective type.

We start with some key results about skew Armendariz and weak skew Armendariz rings. Lemma 4.3 extends [40], Proposition 3.8, and [49], Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 4.3. *If R is a weak skew-Armendariz ring, the equality $ab = 0$ implies $\sigma^\alpha(a)\delta^\alpha(b) = \delta^\alpha(a)b = 0$, for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$.*

Proof. We only show the case $\sigma_i(a)\delta_i(b) = \delta_i(a)b = 0$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Since $ab = 0$, then $0 = \delta_i(ab) = \sigma_i(a)\delta_i(b) + \delta_i(a)b$, or equivalently, $\delta_i(a)b = -\sigma_i(a)\delta_i(b)$. Let $f, g \in A$ given by $f = \delta_i(a)+0x_1+\cdots+0x_{i-1}+\sigma_i(a)x_i+0x_{i+1}+\cdots+0x_n$, and $g = b+bx_1+\cdots+bx_n$, respectively. Note that $fg = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} fg &= \delta_i(a)b + \delta_i(a)bx_1 + \cdots + \delta_i(a)bx_n + \sigma_i(a)x_ib + \sigma_i(a)x_ibx_1 + \cdots + \sigma_i(a)x_ibx_n \\ &= \delta_i(a)b + \delta_i(a)bx_1 + \cdots + \delta_i(a)bx_n + \sigma_i(a)[\sigma_i(b)x_i + \delta_i(b)] + \sigma_i(a)[\sigma_i(b)x_i + \delta_i(b)]x_1 \\ &+ \cdots + \sigma_i(a)[\sigma_i(b)x_i + \delta_i(b)]x_n \\ &= \delta_i(a)b + \delta_i(a)bx_1 + \cdots + \delta_i(a)bx_n + \sigma_i(a)\sigma_i(b)x_i + \sigma_i(a)\delta_i(b) + \sigma_i(a)\sigma_i(b)x_ix_1 \\ &+ \sigma_i(a)\delta_i(b)x_1 + \cdots + \sigma_i(a)\sigma_i(b)x_ix_n + \sigma_i(a)\delta_i(b)x_n = 0. \end{aligned}$$

From Definition 4.2 we obtain $\delta_i(a)b = 0$, so $\sigma_i(a)\delta_i(b) = 0$. □

In [35] and [10], both authors of those papers give a positive answer to the following question formulated in [18], p. 115: Let σ be a monomorphism (or automorphism) of a (commutative) reduced ring B and B be a σ-skew Armendariz. Is B σ-rigid? The content of Theorem 4.4 is the generalization of this answer to skew PBW extensions. We suppose that the elements $c_{i,j}$ in Definition 2.1 (iv) are invertible and commute with every element of R. These assumptions are satisfied for a lot of algebras, for example: any Ore extension $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$, additive analogue of the Weyl algebra, multiplicative analogue of the Weyl algebra, quantum algebra $\mathcal{U}'(\mathfrak{so}(3, \Bbbk))$, 3-dimensional skew polynomial algebras, Dispin algebra $\mathcal{U}(osp(1, 2))$, Woronowicz algebra $\mathcal{W}(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \Bbbk))$, complex algebra $V_q(\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C}))$, q-Heisenberg algebra, quantum enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \Bbbk)$,$\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \Bbbk))$, PBW extensions, almost normalizing extensions, solvable polynomial rings, diffusion algebras, G-algebras with $d_{i,j}$ linear, and others. It is clear that any σ-PBW extension over a field $\Bbbk$ satisfies these assumptions.

Theorem 4.4. *If A is a skew PBW extension of a ring R, then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *R is reduced and skew-Armendariz;*

(ii) *R is Σ-rigid;*

(iii) *A is reduced.*

Proof. (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) This equivalence follows from [46], Proposition 3.5. (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) From [46] we know that a Σ-rigid ring is reduced, and as we saw above, every Σ-rigid ring is also skew-Armendariz. Let us see (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Suppose that R is reduced, skew-Armendariz and is not Σ-rigid. Then there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $a\sigma^\beta(a) = 0$ and $a \neq 0$. Note that $\sigma^\beta(a)\sigma^\beta(\sigma^\beta(a)) = \sigma^\beta(a\sigma^\beta(a)) = 0$. Using that R is reduced, the equality $(\sigma^\beta(a)a)^2 = \sigma^\beta(a)a\sigma^\beta(a)a = 0$ implies $\sigma^\beta(a)a = 0$. Equivalently, since $a \neq 0$, σ^β is injective, and R is reduced, then $\sigma^\beta(a) \neq 0$ and $(\sigma^\beta(a))^2 \neq 0$. With this in mind, consider the elements $f = \sigma^\beta(a) + \sigma^\beta(a)x^\beta$, $g = a - \sigma^\beta(a)x^\beta$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} fg &= (\sigma^{\beta}(a) + \sigma^{\beta}(a)x^{\beta})(a - \sigma^{\beta}(a)x^{\beta}) \\ &= \sigma^{\beta}(a)a - (\sigma^{\beta}(a))^2x^{\beta} + \sigma^{\beta}(a)x^{\beta}a - \sigma^{\beta}(a)x^{\beta}\sigma^{\beta}(a)x^{\beta} \\ &= -(\sigma^{\beta}(a))^2x^{\beta} + \sigma^{\beta}(a)[\sigma^{\beta}(a)x^{\beta} + p_{\beta,a}] - \sigma^{\beta}(a)[\sigma^{\beta}(\sigma^{\beta}(a))x^{\beta} + q_{\beta,\sigma^{\beta}(a)}]x^{\beta} \\ &= \sigma^{\beta}(a)p_{\beta,a} - \sigma^{\beta}(a\sigma^{\beta}(a))x^{\beta}x^{\beta} - \sigma^{\beta}(a)q_{\beta,\sigma^{\beta}(a)}x^{\beta} \\ &= \sigma^{\beta}(a)p_{\beta,a} - \sigma^{\beta}(a)q_{\beta,\sigma^{\beta}(a)}x^{\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

where $p_{\beta,a} = 0$ or $\deg(p_{\beta,a}) < |\beta|$, if $p_{\beta,r} \neq 0$, and $q_{\beta,\sigma^{\beta}(a)} = 0$ or $\deg(q_{\beta,\sigma^{\beta}(a)}) < |\beta|$, if $q_{\beta,\sigma^{\beta}(a)} \neq 0$. Since $a\sigma^{\beta}(a) = \sigma^{\beta}(a)a = 0$, Remark 2.8 and Lemma 4.3 guarantee that $\sigma^{\beta}(a)p_{\beta,a} = \sigma^{\beta}(a)q_{\beta,\sigma^{\beta}(a)}x^{\beta} = 0$, so $fg = 0$. By assumption, R is skew-Armendariz, that is, $-(\sigma^{\beta}(a))^2 = 0$, but $-(\sigma^{\beta}(a))^2 \neq 0$, i.e., we have obtained a contradiction. Hence, R is Σ-rigid. □

Corollary 4.5 ([40], Theorem 3.9, and [49], Theorem 3.6)**.** *If A is a skew PBW extension of a ring R, then the following statements are equivalent:* (i) *R is reduced and (Σ, Δ)-Armendariz (Σ-skew Armendariz)* (ii) *R is Σ-rigid* (iii) *A is reduced.*

Remark 4.6. From [40] we know that Σ-rigid rings $\subsetneq$ (Σ, Δ)-Armendariz rings; from [49], we know that Σ-rigid rings $\subsetneq$ Σ-skew Armendariz rings, and hence Σ-rigid rings $\subsetneq$ skew-Armendariz rings. Hence, [40], Theorem 3.9, [49], Theorem 3.6, and Theorem 4.4, show that if we assume that the ring R is reduced, then for Σ-rigid rings the notions of (Σ, Δ)-Armendariz, Σ-skew Armendariz, and skew-Armendariz, coincide. This fact shows the importance of consider skew PBW extensions over non-reduced rings with the aim of obtaining ring theoretical properties more general than the established in all these papers.

The next proposition generalizes [49], Proposition 3.8.

Proposition 4.7. *If R is a weak skew-Armendariz ring, and $e \in R$ is an idempotent element, we have $\sigma_i(e) = e$ and $\delta_i(e) = 0$, for every $i = 1, \ldots, n$.*

Proof. Consider an idempotent element e of R. Then $\delta_i(e) = \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e) + \delta_i(e)e$. Let $f, g \in A$ given by $f = \delta_i(e) + 0x_1 + \cdots + 0x_{i-1} + \sigma_i(e)x_i + 0x_{i+1} + \cdots + 0x_n$, and $g = e - 1 + (e-1)x_1 + \cdots + (e-1)x_n$, respectively. Recall that $\delta_i(1) = 0$, for every i. Let us show that $fg = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} fg &= \delta_i(e)(e-1) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_i(e)(e-1)x_j\right) + \sigma_i(e)x_i(e-1) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_i(e)x_i(e-1)x_j \\ &= \delta_i(e)(e-1) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_i(e)(e-1)x_j\right) + \sigma_i(e)[\sigma_i(e-1)x_i + \delta_i(e-1)] \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_i(e)[\sigma_i(e-1)x_i + \delta_i(e-1)]x_j. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
fg &= \delta_i(e)(e-1) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_i(e)(e-1)x_j\right) + \sigma_i(e)[(\sigma_i(e)-\sigma_i(1))x_i + \delta_i(e)] \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_i(e)[(\sigma_i(e)-\sigma_i(1))x_i + \delta_i(e)]x_j \\
&= \delta_i(e)(e-1) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_i(e)(e-1)x_j\right) + \sigma_i(e)[\sigma_i(e)x_i - x_i + \delta_i(e)] \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_i(e)[\sigma_i(e)x_i - x_i + \delta_i(e)]x_j \\
&= \delta_i(e)e - \delta_i(e) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} (\delta_i(e)e - \delta_i(e))x_j\right) + \sigma_i(e)x_i - \sigma_i(e)x_i + \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e) \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\sigma_i(e)x_i - \sigma_i(e)x_i + \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e))x_j \\
&= \delta_i(e)e - \delta_i(e) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_i(e)ex_j - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_i(e)x_j + \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e)x_j = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

From Definition 4.2 we obtain $\delta_i(e)(e-1) = 0$, i.e., $\delta_i(e)e = \delta_i(e)$, and hence $\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e) = 0$.

Now, consider the elements s and t of A given by $s = \delta_i(e) - (1-\sigma_i(e))x_i$ and $t = e + \sum_{j=1}^{n} ex_j$, respectively. Let us show that $st = 0$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
st &= \delta_i(e)e + \left(\delta_i(e)e\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j\right) - (1-\sigma_i(e))x_ie - \left((1-\sigma_i(e))x_ie\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j\right) \\
&= \delta_i(e)e + \left(\delta_i(e)e\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j\right) - x_ie + \sigma_i(e)x_ie - x_ie\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j + \sigma_i(e)x_ie\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \\
&= \delta_i(e)e + \left(\delta_i(e)e\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j\right) - (\sigma_i(e)x_i + \delta_i(e)) + \sigma_i(e)(\sigma_i(e)x_i + \delta_i(e)) \\
&- \left((\sigma_i(e)x_i + \delta_i(e))\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j\right) + \sigma_i(e)(\sigma_i(e)x_i + \delta_i(e))\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \\
&= \delta_i(e)e + \left(\delta_i(e)e\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j\right) - \sigma_i(e)x_i - \delta_i(e) + \sigma_i(e)x_i + \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e) - \sigma_i(e)x_i\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \\
&- \delta_i(e)\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j + \sigma_i(e)x_i\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j + \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e)\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\delta_i(e) = \delta_i(e)e$ and $\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e) = 0$, then $st = 0$. By Armendariz condition we know that $\delta_i(e)e = 0$, which shows that $\delta_i(e) = 0$.

Consider the elements $u, v \in A$ given by $u = 1 - e + (1-e)\sigma_i(e)x_i$ and $v = e + (e-1)\sigma_i(e)x_i$.

We have the equalities

$$\begin{aligned}uv &= e+(e-1)\sigma_i(e)x_i-e^2-e(e-1)\sigma_i(e)x_i+(1-e)\sigma_i(e)x_ie+(1-e)\sigma_i(e)x_i(e-1)\sigma_i(e)x_i\\ &= e\sigma_i(e)x_i-\sigma_i(e)x_i-e\sigma_i(e)x_i+e\sigma_i(e)x_i+(1-e)\sigma_i(e)(\sigma_i(e)x_i+\delta_i(e))\\ &+ (1-e)\sigma_i(e)(\sigma_i(e)x_i-x_i+\delta_i(e))\sigma_i(e)x_i\\ &= -\sigma_i(e)x_i+e\sigma_i(e)x_i+\sigma_i(e)x_i+\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e)-e\sigma_i(e)x_i-e\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e)\\ &+ [\sigma_i(e)x_i-\sigma_i(e)x_i+\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e)-e\sigma_i(e)x_i+e\sigma_i(e)x_i-e\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(e)]\sigma_i(e)x_i=0.\end{aligned}$$

Using that $\delta_i(e)=0$, we obtain $(1-e)(e-1)\sigma_i(e)=0$, i.e., $e\sigma_i(e)=\sigma_i(e)$.

Finally, let $w=e+e(1-\sigma_i(e))x_i,\ z=1-e-e(1-\sigma_i(e))x_i$ be elements of A. Then

$$\begin{aligned}wz &= e-e^2-e^2(1-\sigma_i(e))x_i+e(1-\sigma_i(e))x_i-e(1-\sigma_i(e))x_ie-e(1-\sigma_i(e))x_ie(1-\sigma_i(e))x_i\\ &= -e(1-\sigma_i(e))(\sigma_i(e)x_i+\delta_i(e))-e(1-\sigma_i(e))[\sigma_i(e(1-\sigma_i(e)))x_i+\delta_i(e(1-\sigma_i(e)))]x_i.\end{aligned}$$

Using that $\delta_i(e)=0$ and $e\sigma_i(e)=\sigma_i(e)$, we can see that $wz=0$. Hence, $e(-e(1-\sigma_i(e)))=0$, which shows that $e\sigma_i(e)=e$, and so $\sigma_i(e)=e$. □

Proposition 4.8 generalizes [49], Proposition 3.7.

Proposition 4.8. *Let R be a skew-Armendariz ring. If $e^2=e\in A$, with $e=\sum_{i=0}^m e_iX_i$, then $e\in R$.*

Proof. Let $e=e_0+e_1X_1+\cdots+e_mX_m$ be an element of A with $e^2=e$. Since $(e_0+e_1X_1+\cdots e_nX_n)((1-e_0)-e_1X_1-\cdots-e_nX_n)=((1-e_0)-e_1X_1-\cdots-e_nX_n)(e_0+e_1X_1+\cdots e_nX_n)$, the assumption on R implies $e_0(1-e_0)=(1-e_0)e_i=e_0e_i\ (1\leq i\leq n)=0$. Hence $e_i=0$, for every i, which shows that $e=e_0=e_0^2$. □

Proposition 4.9 extends [49], Proposition 3.9.

Proposition 4.9. *Every weak skew-Armendariz ring is Abelian.*

Proof. Let $e^2=e, a\in R$. Consider the elements f,g of A given by $f=e-\sum_{i=1}^n ea(1-e)x_i$, and $g=1-e+\sum_{i=1}^n ea(1-e)x_i$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}fg &= e-e^2+e^2a(1-e)\sum_{i=1}^n x_i-\sum_{i=1}^n ea(1-e)x_i+\sum_{i=1}^n ea(1-e)x_ie\\ &- \left(\sum_{i=1}^n ea(1-e)x_iea(1-e)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n ea(1-e)(\sigma_i(e)x_i+\delta_i(e))-\left(\sum_{i=1}^n ea(1-e)x_i(ea-eae)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\\ &= (ea-eae)\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i(e)x_i\\ &- \left(\sum_{i=1}^n(ea-eae)(\sigma_i(ea-eae)x_i+\delta_i(ea-eae))\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
fg &= (ea - eae)\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i(e)x_i \\
&- \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(ea - eae)((e\sigma_i(a) - e\sigma_i(a)e)x_i + \delta_i(ea) - \delta_i(eae))\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) \\
&= ea\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i(e)x_i - eae\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i(e)x_i \\
&- \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(ea - eae)(e\sigma_i(a)x_i - e\sigma_i(a)ex_i + \sigma_i(e)\delta_i(a) - \sigma_i(ea)\delta_i(e) - \delta_i(ea)e)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) \\
&= ea\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i(e)x_i - eae\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i(e)x_i \\
&- \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(ea - eae)(e\sigma_i(a)x_i - e\sigma_i(a)ex_i + e\delta_i(a) - e\delta_i(a)e)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) \\
&= ea\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i(e)x_i - eae\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i(e)x_i - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}eae\sigma_i(a)x_i - eae\sigma_i(a)ex_i + eae\delta_i(a) - eae\delta_i(a)e\right. \\
&\left. - eae\sigma_i(a)x_i + eae\sigma_i(a)ex_i - eae\delta_i(a) + eae\delta_i(a)e\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since R is weak skew-Armendariz, $eea(1-e) = 0$, that is, $ea = eae$.

Now, consider the elements p, q of A given by $p = 1 - e - \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i$ and $q = e + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i$. Then $pq = 0$. More exactly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
pq &= e + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i - e^2 - e\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_ie \\
&- \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)ae(\sigma_i(e)x_i + \delta_i(e)) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-e)aex_i(1-e)ae\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) \\
&= -\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(ae - eae)(\sigma_i(ae - eae)x_i + \delta_i(ae - eae))\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) \\
&= -\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(ae - eae)(\sigma_i(a)ex_i - e\sigma_i(a)ex_i + \delta_i(a)e - \delta_i(ea)e)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) \\
&= -\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}ae\sigma_i(a)ex_i - ae\sigma_i(a)ex_i + ae\delta_i(a)e - ae\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(a)e - eae\sigma_i(a)ex_i + eae\sigma_i(a)ex_i\right. \\
&\left. - eae\delta_i(a)e + eae\sigma_i(e)\delta_i(a)e\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right) = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

By the weak skew-Armendariz condition, we know that $(1-e)(1-e)ae = 0$, or equivalently, $ae = eae$. Now, as we showed above, $ea = eae$, which means that $ae = ea$, i.e., R is Abelian. $\square$

Propositions 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 imply the following result which generalizes [49], Corollary 3.10.

Proposition 4.10. *If R is a skew-Armendariz ring R, then A is an Abelian ring.*

4.1 Localization of skew-Armendariz rings

In this section we characterize the classical right quotient rings of skew-Armendariz rings.

Let us recall the key facts about noncommutative localization. If B is a ring and S is a multiplicative subset of B ($1 \in S$, $0 \notin S$, $ss' \in S$, for every $s, s' \in S$), then the left ring of fractions of B exists if and only if two conditions hold: (i) given $a \in B$ and $s \in S$ with $as = 0$, there exists $s' \in S$ such that $s'a = 0$; (left Ore condition) given $a \in B$ and $s \in S$, there exist $s' \in S$ and $a' \in B$ with $s'a = a's$. If these conditions hold, then the left ring of fractions of B with respect to S is denoted by $S^{-1}B$, and its elements are classes denoted using fractions. More exactly, $\frac{a}{s} := \frac{b}{t}$ are equal if and only if there exist $c, d \in B$ such that $ca = db$, $cs = dt \in S$; $\frac{a}{s} + \frac{b}{t} := \frac{ca+db}{u}$, where $u := cs = dt \in S$, for some $c, d \in B$; $\frac{a}{s}\frac{b}{t} := \frac{cb}{us}$, where $ua = ct$, for some $u \in S$ and $c \in B$. Similarly, it is defined the right Ore condition and hence the ring of fractions of B. The nonzero divisors elements of B are called *regular* and the set of regular elements of B is denoted by $S_0(B)$. Recall that if B is both left and right Ore, then its classical left ring of quotients $Q^l_{cl}(B)$ and its classical right ring of quotients $Q^r_{cl}(B)$ coincide, and it is denoted by $Q(B)$. A key result about the classical ring of quotients of B is the common denominator property: if B is a ring, $S \subset B$ is a multiplicative subset and $S^{-1}B$ exists, then any finite set $\{q_1, \ldots, q_n\}$ of elements of $S^{-1}B$ posses a common denominator, i.e., there exist $r_1, \ldots, r_n \in B$ and $s \in S$ such that $q_i = \frac{r_i}{s}$ for every i (see [22] for a detailed treatment of localization in non-commutative rings).

Proposition 4.11 ([31], Lemma 2.6)**.** *Let A be a bijective skew PBW extension of a ring R. If $S \subseteq S_0(R)$ is a multiplicative subset of R with $\sigma_i(S) = S$, for every $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then*

(i) *If $S^{-1}R$ exists, then $S^{-1}A$ exists and it is a bijective skew PBW extension of $S^{-1}R$, denoted $S^{-1}A = \sigma(S^{-1}R)\langle x'_1, \ldots, x'_n\rangle$, where $x'_i := \frac{x_i}{1}$, and the systems of constants of $S^{-1}R$ is given by $c'_{i,j} = \frac{c_{i,j}}{1}$, $c'_{i,\frac{r}{s}} := \frac{\sigma_i(r)}{\sigma_i(s)}$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. The automorphisms $\overline{\sigma_i}$ of $S^{-1}R$ and the $\overline{\sigma_i}$-derivations $\overline{\delta_i}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), are defined by $\overline{\sigma_i}(\frac{a}{s}) := \frac{\sigma_i(a)}{\sigma_i(s)}$, and $\overline{\delta_i}(\frac{a}{s}) := -\frac{\delta_i(s)}{\sigma_i(s)}\frac{a}{s} + \frac{\delta_i(a)}{\sigma_i(s)}$. Let $\overline{\Sigma} := \{\overline{\sigma_1}, \ldots, \overline{\sigma_n}\}$ and $\overline{\Delta} := \{\overline{\delta_1}, \ldots, \overline{\delta_n}\}$.*

(ii) *If RS^{-1} exists, then AS^{-1} exists and it is a bijective skew PBW extension of RS^{-1}, denoted $AS^{-1} = \sigma(RS^{-1})\langle x''_1, \ldots, x''_n\rangle$, where $x''_i := \frac{x_i}{1}$, and the systems of constants of $S^{-1}R$ is given by $c''_{i,j} = \frac{c_{i,j}}{1}$, $c''_{i,\frac{r}{s}} := \frac{\sigma_i(r)}{\sigma_i(s)}$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. The automorphisms $\overline{\sigma_i}$ of $S^{-1}R$ and the $\overline{\sigma_i}$-derivations $\overline{\delta_i}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), are defined by $\overline{\sigma_i}(\frac{a}{s}) := \frac{\sigma_i(a)}{\sigma_i(s)}$, and $\overline{\delta_i}(\frac{a}{s}) := -\frac{\sigma_i(a)}{\sigma_i(s)}\frac{\delta_i(s)}{s} + \frac{\delta_i(a)}{s}$. Let $\overline{\Sigma} := \{\overline{\sigma_1}, \ldots, \overline{\sigma_n}\}$ and $\overline{\Delta} := \{\overline{\delta_1}, \ldots, \overline{\delta_n}\}$.*

If no confusion arises, we simply denote x'_i and x''_i by x_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Now, analogously to the definitions of Σ-rigid, skew-Armendariz and weak skew-Armendariz, we consider the notions of $\overline{\Sigma}$-rigid, skew-Armendariz and weak-skew Armendariz, for the classical quotient ring $Q(R)$ of R.

The next theorem generalizes [26], Theorem 16, [38], Theorem 2.3, [39], Theorem 4.7, and [49], Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.12. *Let A be a bijective skew PBW extension of a ring R. If the classical ring of quotients $Q(R)$ of R exists, then R is weak skew-Armendariz if and only if $Q(R)$ is weak skew-Armendariz.*

Proof. It is clear that if $Q(R)$ is weak skew-Armendariz, then R is weak skew-Armendariz.

Conversely, consider $f = c_0^{-1}a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i^{-1}a_i x_i$ and $g = s_0^{-1}b_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j^{-1}b_j x_j$ elements of $S^{-1}A$ such that $fg = 0$. Let us prove that $c_0^{-1}a_0 s_j^{-1}b_j = 0$, for $0 \leq j \leq n$.

We know that there exist $a_i', b_j' \in R$ and $c, s \in S_0(R)$ satisfying $c_i^{-1}a_i = c^{-1}a_i'$ and $s_j^{-1}b_j = s^{-1}b_j'$ for $0 \leq i, j \leq n$. In this way, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left(c^{-1}a_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c^{-1}a_i' x_i\right)\left(s^{-1}b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} s^{-1}b_j' x_j\right) \\
&= \left(a_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i' x_i\right)s^{-1}\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right) \\
&= \left(a_0's^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'[\overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1})x_i + \overline{\delta_i}(s^{-1})]\right)\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right) \\
&= \left(a_0's^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1}x_i - a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1}\delta_i(s)s^{-1})\right)\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right).
\end{aligned}$$

There exist $d_i \in R$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ and $s_2 \in S_0(R)$ such that $\delta_i(s)s^{-1} = s_2^{-1}d_i$, which shows that

$$0 = \left(a_0's^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1}x_i - a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1}s_2^{-1}d_i)\right)\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right).$$

Since there exist $a_0'', a_i'', a_i''' \in R$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ and $s_3, s_4, s_5 \in S_0(R)$ with the relations $a_0's^{-1} = s_3^{-1}a_0''$, $a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1} = s_4^{-1}a_i''$, and $a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1}s_2^{-1} = s_5^{-1}a_i'''$, we have

$$0 = \left(s_3^{-1}a_0'' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (s_4^{-1}a_i''x_i - s_5^{-1}a_i'''d_i)\right)\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right).$$

Again, there exist $d_0, d_i', d_i'' \in R$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ and $t \in S_0(R)$ with $s_3^{-1}a_0'' = t^{-1}d_0$, $s_4^{-1}a_i'' = t^{-1}d_i'$, and $s_5^{-1}a_i''' = t^{-1}d_i''$, which guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left(t^{-1}d_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (t^{-1}d_i'x_i - t^{-1}d_i''d_i)\right)\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right) \\
&= t^{-1}\left(d_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_i'x_i - d_i''d_i)\right)\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$0 = \left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i''d_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'x_i\right)\left(b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right). \tag{4.1}$$

By the Armendariz condition on R, from (4.1) we obtain the relations given by

$$\left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\right) b_j' = 0 \quad (0 \le j \le n), \text{ and } \; d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') = 0 \;\; (1 \le i \le n)\ (0 \le j \le n). \tag{4.2}$$

From the reasoning above we have the following equivalences for expressions in (4.2):

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\right) b_j' = 0 \;&\Leftrightarrow t^{-1}\left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\right) b_j' = 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \left(t^{-1} d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} t^{-1} d_i'' d_i\right) b_j' = 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \left(s_3^{-1} a_0'' - \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_5^{-1} a_i''' d_i\right) b_j' = 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \left(a_0' s^{-1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i' \sigma_i(s)^{-1} s_2^{-1} d_i\right) b_j' = 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \left(a_0' s^{-1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i' \sigma_i(s)^{-1} \delta_i(s) s^{-1}\right) b_j' = 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \left(a_0' s^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i' \overline{\delta_i}(s^{-1})\right) b_j' = 0 \quad (0 \le j \le n),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') = 0 \;&\Leftrightarrow t^{-1} d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') = 0 \Leftrightarrow s_4^{-1} a_i'' \sigma_i(b_j') = 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow a_i' \sigma_i(s)^{-1} \sigma_i(b_j') = 0 \Leftrightarrow a_i' \overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1}) \sigma_i(b_j') = 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow a_i' \overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1}) \overline{\sigma_i}(b_j') = 0 \qquad (1 \le i \le n)\ (0 \le j \le n).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Expression (4.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = &\left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\right) b_0' + \left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right) \\
&+ \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' x_i\right) b_0' + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' x_i\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right) \\
= &\left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\right) b_0' + \left(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' [\sigma_i(b_0') x_i + \delta_i(b_0')] + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' x_i\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j' x_j\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 = &\Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_0' + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_j' x_j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \sigma_i(b_0') x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_0') \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' x_i b_i' x_i + \sum_{i,j \in \{1,\dots,n\},\ i \neq j} d_i' x_i b_j' x_j \\
&= \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_0') + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big\{ \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_j' + d_j' \sigma_j(b_0') \Big\} x_j \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' [\sigma_i(b_i') x_i + \delta_i(b_i')] x_i + \sum_{i,j \in \{1,\dots,n\},\ i \neq j} d_i' x_i b_j' x_j \\
&= \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_0') + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big\{ \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_j' + d_j' \sigma_j(b_0') \Big\} x_j \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \sigma_i(b_i') x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_i') x_i + \sum_{i,j \in \{1,\dots,n\},\ i \neq j} d_i' x_i b_j' x_j \\
&= \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_0') + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big\{ \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_j' + d_j' \sigma_j(b_0') + d_j' \delta_j(b_j') \Big\} x_j \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \sigma_i(b_i') x_i^2 + \sum_{i,j \in \{1,\dots,n\},\ i \neq j} d_i' x_i b_j' x_j. \qquad (4.5)
\end{aligned}
$$

With the purpose of computing the last sum in (4.5), consider the Remark 2.3 (iii). Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 = &\Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_0') \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big\{ \Big(d_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'' d_i\Big) b_j' + d_j' \sigma_j(b_0') + d_j' \delta_j(b_j') \Big\} x_j \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \sigma_i(b_i') x_i^2 \\
&+ \sum_{i,j \in \{1,\dots,n\},\ i \neq j} \Big\{ [d_i' \sigma_i(b_j') + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') c_{i,j}] x_i x_j + [d_j' \delta_j(b_i') + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') r_i^{(i,j)}] x_i \\
&+ [d_i' \delta_i(b_j') + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i')] x_j + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') r^{(i,j)} + d_j' \sigma_j(b_i') \sum_{k=1,\ k \neq i,j}^{n} r_k^{(i,j)} x_k \Big\}. \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.2), the expression (4.6) takes the form

$$
0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_0') + \sum_{j=1}^{n} d_j' \delta_j(b_j') x_j + \sum_{i,j \in \{1,\dots,n\},\ i \neq j} [d_j' \delta_j(b_i') x_i + d_i' \delta_i(b_j') x_j]
$$

or equivalently,

$$
0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i' \delta_i(b_0') + \sum_{i,j \in \{1,\dots,n\}} d_i' \delta_i(b_j') x_j.
$$

By degree relations, we have necessarily the equalities

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'\delta_i(b_0') = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'\delta_i(b_j') = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Indeed, for the first sum in (4.7) we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'\delta_i(b_0') = 0 \ &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} t^{-1}d_i'\delta_i(b_0') = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_4^{-1}a_i''\delta_i(b_0') = 0\\ &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1}\delta_i(b_0') = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} c^{-1}a_i'\sigma_i(s)^{-1}\delta_i(b_0') = 0\\ &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i^{-1}a_i\sigma_i(s)^{-1}\delta_i(b_0') = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the second sum in (4.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i'\delta_i(b_j') = 0 \ &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} t^{-1}d_i'\delta_i(b_j') = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_4^{-1}a_i''\delta_i(b_j') = 0\\ &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\sigma_i(s)^{-1}\delta_i(b_j') = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1})\overline{\delta_i}(b_j') = 0 \quad (0 \le j \le n).\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Now, consider the elements $h = a_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'x_i$, and $k = s^{-1}b_j'$ with $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}hk &= a_0's^{-1}b_j' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'x_is^{-1}b_j'\\ &= a_0's^{-1}b_j' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'[\overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1})\overline{\sigma_i}(b_j')x_i + \overline{\delta_i}(b_j')]\\ &= a_0s^{-1}b_j' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1})\overline{\sigma_i}(b_j')x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\overline{\delta_i}(s^{-1}b_j') \qquad (4.9)\\ &= a_0s^{-1}b_j' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1})\overline{\sigma_i}(b_j')x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\overline{\sigma_i}(s^{-1})\overline{\delta_i}(b_j') + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\overline{\delta_i}(s^{-1})b_j'. \qquad (4.10)\end{aligned}$$

By (4.3), (4.4), and (4.8), we obtain

$$hk = a_0s^{-1}b_j' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\delta_i(s^{-1})b_j' = \left(a_0's^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'\delta_i(s^{-1})\right)b_j' = 0, \quad 1 \le j \le n.$$

Since there exist $m_j \in R$ for every j, and $n \in S_0(R)$ such that $s^{-1}b_j' = m_jn^{-1}$, then we obtain $(a_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'x_i)m_jn^{-1} = 0$, whence $(a_0' + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i'x_i)m_j = 0$. By the Armendariz condition on R, $a_0'm_j = 0$, for every $0 \le j \le n$. Note that $a_0'm_j = 0$ is equivalent to $a_0'm_jn^{-1} = 0$, that is, $a_0's^{-1}b_j' = 0$. Since we have the equivalences

$$a_0's^{-1}b_j' = 0 \Leftrightarrow c^{-1}a_0's_j^{-1}b_j = 0 \Leftrightarrow c_0^{-1}a_0s_j^{-1}b_j = 0, \quad 0 \le j \le n, \tag{4.11}$$

we have proved that the ring $Q(R)$ of R is weak skew-Armendariz. □

5 Invariant ideals, Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p. and p.q.-Baer rings

Kaplansky [24] defined a ring B as a *Baer* (resp. *quasi-Baer*, which was defined by Clark in [9]) ring if the right annihilator of every nonempty subset (resp. ideal) of B is generated by an idempotent (the objective of these rings is to abstract various properties of von Neumann algebras and complete $*$-regular rings; in [9], it was used the quasi-Baer concept to characterize when a finite-dimensional algebra with unity over an algebraically closed field is isomorphic to a twisted matrix units semigroup algebra). Another generalization of Baer rings are the p.p.-rings. A ring B is called *right* (resp. *left*) *p.p* if the right (resp. *left*) annihilator of each element of B is generated by an idempotent (or equivalently, rings in which each principal right (resp. *left*) ideal is projective). Birkenmeir et. al., [6] defined a ring *right* (resp. *left*) *principally quasi-Baer* (or simply *right* (resp. *left*) *p.q-Baer*) ring if the right annihilator of each principal right (resp. left) ideal of B is generated by an idempotent. Note that in a reduced ring B, B is Baer (resp. p.p.-) if and only if B is quasi-Baer (resp. p.q.-Baer).

We have studied the uniform dimension (also known as Goldie dimension) and the prime ideals of σ-PBW extensions (see [45] and [32], respectively), using the notion of invariant ideal. With this in mind and with the purpose of establishing some relations between these concepts and the property of being quasi-Baer, in this section we consider the notion of (Σ, Δ)-quasi-baer rings. We will say that a ring B with a family of automorphisms Σ and a family of Σ-derivations Δ is called (Σ, Δ)-*quasi-Baer* if the right annihilator of every (Σ, Δ)-*ideal* (i.e., an ideal I such that $\sigma_i(I) = I$ and $\delta_i(I) \subseteq I$, for all i with $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$, and $\delta_i \in \Delta$) of B is generated by an idempotent of B for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. The results presented in this section generalize the treatment developed in [39] for Ore extensions of injective type.

Since we concern with the properties of being Baer (quasi-Baer) over a skew PBW extension of a Baer (quasi-Baer) ring, we need to establish a criterion which allows us to extend the family Σ of injective endomorphisms, and the family of Σ-derivations Δ of the ring R (Proposition 2.2) to the ring A. With this aim, for the next result consider the injective endomorphisms $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$, and the σ_i-derivations $\delta_i \in \Delta$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ formulated in Proposition 2.2.

Theorem 5.1. *Let A be a skew PBW extension of a ring R. Suppose that $\sigma_i\delta_j = \delta_j\sigma_i$, $\delta_i\delta_j = \delta_j\delta_i$, and $\delta_k(c_{i,j}) = \delta_k(r_l^{(i,j)}) = 0$, for $1 \leq i, j, l \leq n$, where $c_{i,j}$ and $r_l^{(i,j)}$ are the elements established in Definition 2.1. If $\overline{\sigma_k} : A \to A$ and $\overline{\delta_k} : A \to A$ are the functions given by $\overline{\sigma_k}(f) := \sigma_k(a_0) + \sigma_k(a_1)X_1 + \cdots + \sigma_k(a_m)X_m$ and $\overline{\delta_k}(f) := \delta_k(a_0) + \delta_k(a_1)X_1 + \cdots + \delta_k(a_m)X_m$, for every $f = a_0 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_mX_m \in A$, respectively, and $\overline{\sigma_k}(r) := \sigma_i(k)$, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $\overline{\sigma_k}$ is an injective endomorphism of A and $\overline{\delta_k}$ is a $\overline{\sigma_k}$-derivation of A.*

Proof. It is clear that $\overline{\sigma_i}$ is an injective endomorphism of A, and that $\overline{\delta_i}$ is an additive map of A, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Next, we show that $\overline{\delta_i}(fg) = \overline{\sigma_i}(f)\overline{\delta_i}(g) + \overline{\delta_i}(f)g$, for $f, g \in A$.

Consider the elements $f = a_0 + a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + \cdots + a_mX_m$ and $g = b_0 + b_1Y_1 + b_2Y_2 + \cdots + b_tY_t$. Since $\overline{\sigma_k}$ and $\overline{\delta_k}$ are additive, for every i, it is enough to show that

$$\overline{\delta_k}(a_iX_ib_jY_j) = \overline{\sigma_k}(a_iX_i)\overline{\delta_k}(b_jY_j) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_iX_i)b_jY_j, \tag{5.1}$$

for every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. As an illustration of the necessity of the assumptions above, consider the

next particular computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\delta_k}(bx_jax_i) &= \overline{\delta_k}b(\sigma_j(a)x_j + \delta_j(a))x_i) = \overline{\delta_k}(b\sigma_j(a)x_jx_i + b\delta_j(a)x_1)\\
&= \overline{\delta_k}\bigg(b\sigma_j(a)\bigg(c_{i,j}x_ix_j + r_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{n} r_lx_l\bigg) + b\delta_j(a)x_i\bigg)\\
&= \overline{\delta_k}\bigg(b\sigma_j(a)c_{i,j}x_ix_j + b\sigma_j(a)r_0 + b\sigma_j(a)\sum_{l=1}^{n} r_lx_l + b\delta_j(a)x_i\bigg)\\
&= \delta_k(b\sigma_j(a)c_{i,j})x_ix_j + \delta_k(b\sigma_j(a)r_0) + \sum_{l=1}^{n}\delta_k(b\sigma_j(a)r_l)x_l + \delta_k(b\delta_j(a))x_i\\
&= \sigma_k(b\sigma_j(a))\delta_j(c_{i,j})x_ix_j + \delta_k(b\sigma_j(a))c_{i,j}x_ix_j + \sigma_k(b\sigma_j(a))\delta_i(r_0)\\
&+ \delta_k(b\sigma_j(a))r_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{n}\sigma_k(b\sigma_j(a))\delta_i(r_l)x_l + \sum_{l=1}^{n}\delta_k(b\sigma_j(a))r_lx_l\\
&+ \sigma_k(b)\delta_k(\delta_j(a))x_i + \delta_k(b)\delta_j(a)x_i\\
&= \sigma_k(b)\sigma_k(\sigma_j(a))\delta_j(c_{i,j})x_ix_j + \sigma_k(b)\delta_k(\sigma_j(a))c_{i,j}x_ix_j + \delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)c_{i,j}x_ix_j\\
&+ \sigma_k(b)\sigma_k(\sigma_j(a))\delta_i(r_0) + \sigma_k(b)\delta_k(\sigma_j(a))r_0 + \delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)r_0\\
&+ \sum_{l=1}^{n}\sigma_k(b)\sigma_k(\sigma_j(a))\delta_i(r_l)x_l + \sum_{l=1}^{n}\sigma_k(b)\delta_k(\sigma_j(a))r_lx_l + \sum_{l=1}^{n}\delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)r_lx_l\\
&+ \sigma_k(b)\delta_k(\delta_j(a))x_i + \delta_k(b)\delta_j(a)x_i. \qquad (5.2)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\sigma_k}(bx_j)\overline{\delta_k}(ax_i) + \overline{\delta_k}(bx_j)ax_i &= \sigma_k(b)x_j\delta_k(a)x_i + \delta_k(b)x_jax_i\\
&= \sigma_k(b)(\sigma_j(\delta_k(a))x_j + \delta_j(\delta_k(a)))x_i + \delta_k(b)(\sigma_j(a)x_j + \delta_j(a))x_i\\
&= \sigma_k(b)\sigma_j(\delta_k(a))x_jx_i + \sigma_k(b)\delta_j(\delta_k(a))x_i + \delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)x_jx_i\\
&+ \delta_k(b)\delta_j(a)x_i\\
&= \sigma_k(b)\sigma_j(\delta_k(a))\bigg(c_{i,j}x_ix_j + r_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{n} r_lx_l\bigg) + \sigma_k(b)\delta_j(\delta_k(a))x_i\\
&+ \delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)\bigg(c_{i,j}x_ix_j + r_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{n} r_lx_l\bigg) + \delta_k(b)\delta_j(a)x_i
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\sigma_k}(bx_j)\overline{\delta_k}(ax_i) + \overline{\delta_k}(bx_j)ax_i &= \sigma_k(b)\sigma_j(\delta_k(a))c_{i,j}x_ix_j + \sigma_k(b)\sigma_j(\delta_k(a))r_0\\
&+ \sigma_k(b)\sigma_j(\delta_k(a))\sum_{l=1}^{n} r_lx_l\\
&+ \sigma_k(b)\delta_j(\delta_k(a))x_i + \delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)c_{i,j}x_ix_j + \delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)r_0\\
&+ \delta_k(b)\sigma_j(a)\sum_{l=1}^{n} r_lx_l + \delta_k(b)\delta_j(a)x_i. \qquad (5.3)
\end{aligned}$$

If we want that the expressions (5.2) and (5.3) represent the same value, that is,

$$\overline{\delta_k}(bx_jax_i) = \overline{\sigma_k}(bx_j)\overline{\delta_k}(ax_i) + \overline{\delta_k}(bx_j)ax_i, \qquad 1 \leq i, j, k, \leq n$$

then we have to impose that $\sigma_i\delta_j = \delta_j\sigma_i$, $\delta_i\delta_j = \delta_j\delta_i$, $\delta_k(c_{i,j}) = \delta_k(r_l^{(i,j)}) = 0$, for $1 \leq i, j, l \leq n$, where $c_{i,j}$ and $r_l^{(i,j)}$ are the elements established in Definition 2.1. This justifies the assumptions in our theorem.

Now, the proof of the general case, that is, the expression (5.1), it follows from the above reasoning and Remark 2.8. Let us see the details. Consider the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\delta_k}(a_iX_ib_jY_j) &= \overline{\delta_k}(a_i(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)X_i + p_{\alpha_i,b_j})Y_j) = \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)X_iY_j + a_ip_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j)\\
&= \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)(c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + a_ip_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j)\\
&= \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j} + a_ip_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j)\\
&= \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j})x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_ip_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j)\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))\delta_k(c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j})x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + \delta_k(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j}\\
&+ \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_ip_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j)\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma_k(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))\delta_k(c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j})x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + \sigma_k(a_i)\delta_k(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j}\\
&+ \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_ip_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\sigma_k}(a_iX_i)\overline{\delta_k}(b_jY_j) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_iX_i)b_jY_j &= \sigma_k(a_i)X_i\delta_k(b_j)Y_j + \delta_k(a_i)X_ib_jY_j\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))X_i + p_{\alpha_i,\delta_k(b_j)})Y_j\\
&+ \delta_k(a_i)(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)X_i + p_{\alpha_i,b_j})Y_j\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))X_iY_j) + \sigma_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,\delta_k(b_j)}Y_j\\
&+ \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)X_iY_j + \delta_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))(c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \sigma_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,\delta_k(b_j)}Y_j\\
&+ \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)(c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \delta_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j} + \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}\\
&+ \sigma_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,\delta_k(b_j)}Y_j + \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}x^{\alpha_i+\beta_j}\\
&+ \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j} + \delta_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j.
\end{aligned}$$

By assumption, we have the equalities $\sigma_k(a_i)\delta_k(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)) = \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))$ and $\delta_k(c_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) = 0$, which means that we need to prove the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_ip_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j) &= \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j} + \sigma_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,\delta_k(b_j)}Y_j\\
&+ \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j} + \delta_k(a_i)p_{\alpha_i,b_j}Y_j. \qquad (5.4)
\end{aligned}$$

However, note that this equality is a consequence of the linearity of δ_k, Remark 2.8, and the assumptions established in the formulation of the theorem. More precisely, using these facts we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\delta}_k(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) &= \overline{\sigma_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))\overline{\delta_k}(p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_i\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma_k(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))\overline{\delta_k}(p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}) + \sigma_k(a_i)\delta_k(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j} + \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)\delta_k(\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j))p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j} + \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}\\
&= \sigma_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(\delta_k(b_j))p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j} + \delta_k(a_i)\sigma^{\alpha_i}(b_j)p_{\alpha_i,\beta_j}, \qquad (5.5)
\end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\delta_k}(a_i p_{\alpha_i,b_j} Y_j) &= \overline{\sigma_k}(a_i)\overline{\delta_k}(p_{\alpha_i,b_j} Y_j) + \overline{\delta_k}(a_i) p_{\alpha_i,b_j} Y_j \\ &= \sigma_k(a_i) p_{\alpha_i,\delta_k(b_j)} Y_j + \delta_k(a_i) p_{\alpha_i,b_j} Y_j, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where we can see that expression (5.4) is precisely the sum of (5.5) and (5.6). Therefore $\overline{\delta_i}$ is a $\overline{\sigma_i}$-derivation of A. □

Birkenmeier, Kim, and Park in [7], defined an idempotent $e \in B$ as left (resp. right) *semicentral* in B, if $exe = xe$ (resp. $exe = ex$), for all $x \in B$. Equivalently, $e^2 = e \in B$ is left (resp. right) semicentral if eB (resp. Be) is an ideal of B. Since the right annihilator of a right ideal is an ideal, we see that the right annihilator of a right ideal is generated by a left semicentral in a quasi-Baer ring. $\mathcal{S}_l(B)$ and $\mathcal{S}_r(B)$ denote the sets of all left and right semicentral idempotents of B, respectively. Note that $\mathcal{S}_l(B) \cap \mathcal{S}_r(B) = \mathcal{B}(B)$, where $\mathcal{B}(B)$ is the set of all central idempotents of B. If B is a semiprime ring then $\mathcal{S}_l(B) = \mathcal{S}_r(B)\mathcal{B}(B)$.

The next theorem generalizes [39], Theorem 3.8.

Theorem 5.2. *Let A be a bijective skew PBW extension of a ring R with $\sigma_i(e) = e$ and $\delta_i(e) = 0$, for any left semicentral idempotent $e \in R$, and every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Suppose the conditions established in Theorem 5.1 hold. If R is a (Σ, Δ)-quasi Baer ring, then A is a $\overline{\Sigma}$-quasi Baer ring.*

Proof. Let I be a $\overline{\Sigma}$-ideal of A. Consider I_0 as the set of all leading coefficients of all elements of I. Then I_0 is a left ideal of R. Now, since $\overline{\sigma_i}(I) = I$, then $\sigma_i(I_0) = I_0$, for every $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$. It is easy to see that $\delta_i(I_0) \subseteq I_0$, for every i. In this way, I_0 is an (Σ, Δ)-ideal of R, so $r_R(I_0) = eR$ for some left semicentral idempotent e of R. The idea is to prove that $r_A(I) = eA$. Let $f \in I$ expressed as $f = a_0 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_mX_m$, with $\deg(f) = |\exp(X_m)|$ and $\mathrm{lc}(f) = a_m$. We have $fe = (a_0 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_{m-1}X_{m-1})e + a_mX_me$. As we can see from Remark 2.8, the product X_me involves the elements $\sigma_j(e)$ and $\delta_k(e)$ $(1 \leq j, k \leq n)$, which are zero by assumption, so $X_me = 0$. Since $fe \in I$, then $\mathrm{lc}(fe) \in I_0$. By the assumption on $\sigma_i(e)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, we can see that $\mathrm{lc}(fe) = a_{m-1}e$, i.e., $a_{m-1}e \in I_0$, so $a_{m-1}e = 0$. Following this reasoning, we obtain $fe = 0$, which guarantees the inclusion $eA \subseteq r_A(I)$.

Let $g \in r_A(I),\ f \in I$. Since I is a $\overline{\Sigma}$-ideal, the equality $fg = 0$ implies $\sigma^{\alpha_m}(f)g = 0$, where $f = a_0 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_mX_m, g = b_0 + b_1Y_1 + \cdots + b_sY_s$, and $\alpha_m = \deg(X_m)$. Since A is bijective, $\mathrm{lc}(\sigma^{\alpha_m}(f)g) = \sigma^{\alpha_m}(a_m)\sigma^{\alpha_m}(b_s) = \sigma^{\alpha_m}(a_mb_s) = 0$, from which we conclude that $a_mb_s = 0$, that is, $b_s \in r_R(I_0) = eR$, so $b_s = er'$, for some element $r' \in R$. Using that $Re = eRe$, we have $eb_s = e^2r' = er' = b_s$. From the equality $0 = fg = f(b_0 + b_1Y_1 + \cdots + b_{s-1}Y_{s-1}) + fb_sY_s$ and the fact $fe = 0$, we conclude that $febsY_s = fb_sY_s = 0$.

Now, since $\sigma^{\alpha_m}(f)(b_0 + b_1Y_1 + \cdots + b_{s-1}Y_{s-1}) = 0$ and $\mathrm{lc}(\sigma^{\alpha_m}(f)g) = \sigma^{\alpha_m}(a_m)\sigma^{\alpha_m}(b_{s-1}) = 0$, then $a_mb_{s-1} = 0$. It is easy to see that $b_{s-1} = eb_{s-1}$, so continuing in this way we can show that b_jeb_j for $0 \leq j \leq s$, which proves that $r_A(I) \subseteq eA$. Therefore $r_A(I) = eA$. □

The next theorem generalizes [39], Theorem 3.9.

Theorem 5.3. *Let A be a bijective skew PBW extension of R. Suppose the conditions established in Theorem 5.1 hold. If R is skew-Armendariz, then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *R is a (Σ, Δ)-quasi Baer ring;*

2. A is a $\overline{\Sigma}$-quasi Baer ring;

3. A is a $(\overline{\Sigma}, \overline{\Delta})$-quasi Baer ring for every extended $\overline{\alpha}_i$-derivation $\overline{\delta}_i$ of A.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). The assertion follows from Proposition 4.7 and Theorem 5.2. (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). It is easy. (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let I be an (Σ, Δ)-ideal of R. Then IA is an $(\overline{\Sigma}, \overline{\Delta})$-ideal of A, so $r_A(IA) = eA$ for some idempotent $e \in A$, and by Proposition 4.8, $e \in R$. Next we show that $r_R(I) = r_A(IA) \cap R$.

Consider an element h of IA. Then $h = \sum_{j=1}^{s} r_j f_j$, $r_j \in I$, $f_j \in A$. Since $r \in r_R(I)$, Remark 2.8 and Lemma 4.3 guarantee that $r_j f_j r = 0$, for every j, and hence $hr = 0$. Sinc $r_A(IA) \cap R \subseteq r_R(I)$, then $r_R(I) = r_A(IA) \cap R$, and using that $r_A(IA) \cap R = eA \cap R = eR$, we conclude the desired equality. □

Remark 5.4. It is important to say that the class of Σ-quasi Baer rings (respectively, Δ-quasi Baer rings) strictly contains the class of quasi-Baer rings. This assertion can be appreciated in the case of Ore extensions of bijective type. More exactly, in [15], Example 2, it was presented an example of an α-quasi Baer ring B which is not quasi-Baer but $B[x; \alpha]$ is a quasi-Baer ring; in [12], Example 2, it was provided an example of a δ-quasi Baer ring which is not quasi-Baer but $B[x; \delta]$ is a quasi-Baer ring. In this way, our results generalize the treatment presented in [46] about skew PBW extensions of quasi-Baer rings. Now, the bijectivity of the injective endomorphisms A in Theorem 5.3 can not be eliminated, as we can appreciate in the particular case of Ore extensions ([19], Example 2).

Next, we consider the relationship between the properties of being Baer and p.p. of a ring R and a skew PBW extension A of R. Recall that a ring is Abelian and Baer if and only if is reduced and quasi-Baer ([8]).

The next theorem generalizes [39], Theorem 3.11, [46], Theorem 3.9, [40], Theorem 4.1, and [49], Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.5. *Let A be a skew PBW extension of a ring R. If R is skew-Armendariz, then R is a Baer ring if and only if A is a Baer ring.*

Proof. Let R be a skew-Armendariz and Baer ring. From Proposition 4.9 we know that R is an Abelian Baer ring, and hence R is a reduced Baer ring. By Theorem 4.4, R is a Σ-rigid ring. From [46], Theorem 3.9, it follows that A is a Baer ring.

Suppose that A is a Baer ring. Since R is a skew-Armendariz ring, A is an Abelian ring by Corollary 4.10, so A is reduced. In particular, R is reduced, and hence R is Σ-rigid. Therefore, R is Baer ([46], Theorem 3.9). □

The next theorem generalizes [39], Theorem 3.12, [46], Theorem 3.12, [40], Theorem 4.2, and [49], Theorem 5.3

Theorem 5.6. *Let A be a bijective skew PBW extension of a ring R. If R is skew-Armendariz, then R is a p.p.-ring if and only if A is a p.p.-ring*

Proof. Let R be a skew-Armendariz and Baer ring. We know that R is an Abelian Baer ring, so reduced. Theorem 4.4 guarantees that R is Σ-rigid ring, and from [46], Theorem 3.12, it follows that A is a p.p.-ring.

Let A be a p.p.- ring. By assumption, R is a skew-Armendariz ring, so A is an Abelian ring and hence reduced. Since R is Σ-rigid, R is a Baer ring ([46], Theorem 3.12). □

Bell in [4] defined the following: a ring B is said to satisfy the IFP (*insertion of factors property*) if $r_B(a)$ is an ideal for all $a \in B$ (sometimes, a ring with IFP is also called a *semi-commutative ring*). Reduced rings have IFP. In Huh et al. [20], Example 2, it is presented a ring with IFP over which the polynomial ring need not satisfy IFP; in [42], Proposition 4.6, one find that if B is Armendariz wih IFP, then $B[x]$ is Armendariz with IFP; in [20] one find a ring which is Armendariz but do not satisfy IFP.

The following theorem generalizes [39], Theorem 3.13, and [46], Theorems 3.10 and 3.13, and include a partial generalization of [40], Theorems 4.3, 4.4, and [49], Corollary 5.5.

Theorem 5.7. *Let A be a skew PBW extension of a ring R. If R a skew-Armendariz ring, then R is a quasi Baer (respectively, p.q.-Baer) ring with IFP if and only if A is a quasi Baer (respectively, p.q.-Baer) ring with IFP.*

Proof. If R is a quasi-Baer ring with IFP, then R is reduced, and hence Baer ([6], Proposition 1.14; [7], Lemma 1.9). By Theorem 5.5, A is Baer. By Corollary 4.10, A is an Abelian Baer ring and hence it is reduced. Thus A has IFP. The converse is similar. □

Proposition 5.8. *If A is a skew PBW extension of an Abelian ring R, then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) *R is (weak) skew-Armendariz;*

(ii) *For every idempotent $e \in R$ with $\sigma_i(e) = e$ and $\delta_i(e) = 0$, eR and $(1-e)R$ are (weak) skew-Armendariz;*

(iii) *For some idempotent $e \in R$ such that $\sigma_i(e) = e$ and $\delta_i(e) = 0$, eR and $(1-e)R$ are (weak) skew-Armendariz.*

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) It is easy to see that if R is a (weak) skew-Armendariz ring, then for each idempotent $e \in R$, eR and $(1-e)R$ are also (weak) skew-Armendariz rings. So, the assertion follows from Proposition 4.7. (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) It is clear. (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Let $f, g \in A$ given by $f = a_0 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_mX_m$, $g = b_0 + b_1Y_1 + \cdots + b_tY_t$, with with $fg = 0$. Since $f = (1-e)f + ef$, $g = (1-e)g + eg$, $\sigma_i(e) = e$, $\delta_i(e) = 0$, and R is Abelian, then $efg = 0$, so $\mathrm{lc}(efg) = ea_0b_j = 0$ for $0 \leq j \leq t$. In this way, $(1-e)fg = 0$, that is, $\mathrm{lc}((1-e)fg) = (1-e)a_0b_j = 0$, and so ea_0b_j from which $a_0b_j = 0$, for every $0 \leq j \leq m$, i.e., R is skew-Armendariz. □

Acknowledgements

The first author is supported by Grant HERMES Code 30366, Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia.

References

[1] Anderson, D. D., Camillo, V., Armendariz rings and Gaussian rings, *Comm. Algebra* 26 (1998), No. 7, 2265-2275.

[2] Annin, S., Associated primes over skew polynomial rings, *Comm. Algebra* 30 (2002), No. 5, 2511-2528.

[3] Armendariz, E. P., A note on extensions of Baer and p.p.-rings, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* 18 (1974), 470-473.

[4] Bell, H. E., Near-rings in which each element is a power of itself, *Bull. Australian Math. Soc.* 2 (1970), 363-368.

[5] Bell, A., Goodearl, K. Uniform rank over differential operator rings and Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt extensions, *Pacific J. Math.*, 131 (1988), No. 11. 13-37.

[6] Birkenmeier, G. F., Kim, J. Y., Park, J. K., Principally quasi-Baer rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 29 (2001), No. 2, 639-660.

[7] Birkenmeier, G. F., Kim, J. Y., Park, J. K., Polynomial extensions of Baer and quasi-Baer rings, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 159 (2001), 24-42.

[8] Birkenmeier, G. F., Park, J. K., Rizvi, S. T., *Extensions of Rings and Modules*, Birkhäuser, New York, 2013.

[9] Clark, W. E., Twisted matrix units semigroup algebras, *Duke Math. J.* 34 (1967), 417-424.

[10] Chen, W., Tong, W., A note on skew Armendariz rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 33 (2005), 1137-1140.

[11] Gallego, C., Lezama, O., Gröbner bases for ideals of σ-PBW extensions, *Comm. Algebra*, 39 (2011), No. 1, 50-75.

[12] Han, J., Hirano, Y., Kim, H., Semiprime Ore extensions, *Comm. Algebra* 28 (2000), No. 8, 3795-3801.

[13] Hashemi, E., Moussavi, A., Haj Seyyed Javadi, H., Polynomial Ore extensions of Baer and p.p.-rings, *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.* 29 (2003), No. 2, 65-86.

[14] Hashemi, E., Moussavi, A., Polynomial extensions of quasi-Baer rings, *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 107 (2005), No. 3, 207-224.

[15] Hirano, Y., On ordered monoid rings over a quasi-Baer ring, *Comm. Algebra*, 29 (2001), No. 5, 2089-2095.

[16] Hirano, Y., On annihilator ideals of a polynomial ring over a noncommutative ring, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 168 (2002), 45-52.

[17] Hong, C. Y., Kim, N. K., Kwak, T. K., Ore extensions of Baer and p.p.-rings, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 151 (2000), 215-226.

[18] Hong, C. Y., Kim, N. K., Kwak, T. K., On skew Armendariz rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 31 (2003), No. 1, 103-122.

[19] Hong, C. Y., Kim, N. K., Lee, Y., Ore Extensions of Quasi-Baer Rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 37 (2009), 2030-2039.

[20] Huh, C., Lee, Y., Smoktunowicz, A., Armendariz rings and semicommutative rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 30 (2002), No. 2, 751-761.

[21] Isaev, A. P., Pyatov, P. N., and Rittenberg, V., Diffusion algebras, *J. Phys. A.*, 34 (2001), No. 29, 5815-5834.

[22] Jategaonkar, A. V., *Localization in Noetherian rings*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 98, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

[23] Kandri-Rody, A., Weispfenning, V., Non-commutative Gröbner Bases in Algebras of Solvable Type, *J. Symbolic Computation*, 9 (1990), 1-26.

[24] Kaplansky, I., *Rings of Operators*. New York, Benjamin, 1968.

[25] Kerr, J. W., The polynomial ring over a Goldie ring need not be a Goldie ring, *J. Algebra*, 134 (1990), 344-352.

[26] Kim, N. K., Lee, Y., Armendariz rings and reduced rings, *J. Algebra*, 223 (2000), 477-488.

[27] Kredel, H., Solvable Polynomial Rings. Verlag Shaker, Aachen (1993).

[28] Krempa, J., Some examples of reduced rings, *Algebra Colloq.*, 3 (1996), No. 4, 289-300.

[29] Lee, T. K., Wong, T. L., On Armendariz rings, *Houston J. Math.*, 29 (2003), No. 3, 583-593.

[30] Levandovskyy, V, Non-commutative Computer Algebra for Polynomial Algebras: Gröbner Bases, Applications and Implementation. Doctoral Thesis, Universität Kaiserslautern, (2005).

[31] Lezama, O., Acosta, J., Chaparro, C., Ojeda, I. and Venegas, C., Ore and Goldie theorems for skew PBW extensions, *Asian-Eur. J. Math.*, 6 (2013), No. 4, 1350061-1 - 1350061-20.

[32] Lezama, O., Acosta, J., Reyes, A., Prime ideals of skew PBW extensions, *Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina*, 56 (2015), No. 2, 39-55.

[33] Lezama, O., Reyes, A., Some homological properties of skew PBW extensions, *Comm. Algebra*, 42 (2014), No. 3, 1200-1230.

[34] McConnell, J. and Robson, J., *Non-commutative Noetherian Rings*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, AMS, 2001.

[35] Matczuk, J., A characterization of σ-rigid Rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 32 (2004), No. 11, 4333-4336.

[36] Mohamed I., L'Moufadal, B. Y., On quasi-Baer rings of Ore extensions, *East-West J. Math.*, 8 (2006), No. 2, 119-127.

[37] Moussavi, A., Hashemi, E., On (α, δ)-skew Armendariz rings, *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, 42 (2005), No. 2, 353-363.

[38] Nasr-Isfahani, A. R., Moussavi, A., On classical quotient rings of skew Armendariz rings, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, (2007), 1-7.

[39] Nasr-Isfahani, A. R., Moussavi, A., Ore Extensions of skew Armendariz rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 36 (2008), No. 2, 508-522.

[40] Niño, D. Reyes, A., Some ring theoretical properties for skew Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt extensions, *to appear*.

[41] Ore, O., Theory of Non-Commutative Polynomials, *Ann. of Math.*, Second Series, 34 (1933), No. 3, 480-508.

[42] Rege, M. B., Chhawchharia, S., Armendariz Rings, *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, 73 (1997), 14-17.

[43] Reyes A., Ring and module theoretical properties of σ-PBW extensions, Thesis (Ph.D.), Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, (2013).

[44] Reyes, A., Gelfand-Kirillov Dimension of Skew PBW Extensions, *Rev. Colombiana Mat.*, 47 (2013), No. 1, 95-111.

[45] Reyes, A., Uniform Dimension over Skew PBW Extensions, *Rev. Colombiana Mat.*, 48 (2014), No. 1, 79-96.

[46] Reyes, A., Skew PBW Extensions of Baer, quasi-Baer, p.p. and p.q.-rings, *Rev. Integr. Temas Mat.*, 33 (2015), No. 2, 173-189.

[47] Reyes, A., Suárez, H., A note on zip and reversible skew PBW extensions, *Bol. Mat. (N.S.)*, 23 (2016), No. 1, 71-79.

[48] Reyes, A., Suárez, H., Some remarks about the cyclic homology of skew PBW extensions, *Ciencia en Desarrollo* 7 (2016), No. 2, 99-107.

[49] Reyes, A., Suárez, H., Armendariz property for skew PBW extensions and their classical ring of quotients, *to appear.*

[50] Suárez, H., Lezama, O., Reyes, A., Some Relations between N-Koszul, Artin-Schelter Regular and Calabi-Yau algebras with Skew PBW Extensions, *Ciencia en Desarrollo* 6 (2015), No. 2, 205-213.